

REMARKS

The examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search and for considering the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on August 10, 2005.

Claims 5-7, 9-10, 12, 14, 16, and 23 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Hence, Claims 5-7, 9-10, 12, 14, 16-20, and 23-24 are pending in the application.

I. SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW

The Examiner is thanked for extending the courtesy of a telephone interview on August 1, 2006. Applicants' representatives Christopher J. Palermo and Stoycho D. Draganoff, and Examiner Syed Zia participated in the interview. The claims discussed were Claims 5 and 12. The reference discussed was Mead et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,680,942 ("MEAD").

In a communication mailed August 15, 2006, the Examiner has provided an Interview Summary which appears accurate and is adopted herein. For this reason, the Applicant understands that it is not necessary to provide a separate Summary of Record of Interview at this time.

II. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 5, 7, 9-10, 12, 14, 16-18, 20, and 23-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by MEAD.

Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over MEAD in view of Day, II et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,968,116 ("DAY").

Claim 19 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over MEAD in view of Nessett et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,968,176 (“NESSETT”).

III. ISSUED RELATED TO THE CITED ART

A. MEAD does not disclose the “locator service” features of Claims 5-7, 9-10, 17, and 23-24.

Independent Claim 23, and Claim 24 that depends from Claim 23, include the feature of “**a locator service** coupled to the directory enabling element and **configured to locate servers that provide the directory services in the network.**” Independent Claims 5 and 7, and all dependent claims that depend from Claims 5 and 7 (Claims 6 and 9-10), include a similar feature. Claim 17 also includes a similar feature, “**locating a nearest directory server** and binding the application program to the nearest directory server that is located.” MEAD does not describe, teach, or suggest, the claimed locator service features.

The Office Action asserts that such locator service feature is described in MEAD in col. 15, lines 33-67. This is incorrect. The passage in col. 15, lines 33-67 in MEAD describes some general features of the LDAP protocol and has nothing to do with a locator service. As described in MEAD, the LDAP protocol does not provide any means for “locating” an LDAP server from among the servers established in a network. For example, the “searchRequest” LDAP operation (described in MEAD in col. 17, line 44 to col. 18, line 67) allows a client to request that the LDAP server searches the LDAP database on behalf of the client. In contrast, the locator service features of Claims 5-7, 9-10, 17, and 23-24 allows applications executing in a network element (such as a router or a switch) to locate proximate directory services.

Since MEAD does not describe or suggest any locator service features, MEAD does not anticipate Claims 5-7, 9-10, 17, and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). For this reason, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 5-7, 9-10, 17, and 23-24 is respectfully requested.

B. MEAD does not disclose the “event service” features of Claims 7, 10, 12, 14, and 16-20.

Claims 7, 10, 12 and 14 recite “**an event service** coupled to the directory enabling element [...] and **configured to receive registration of an event and an associated responsive action from an application program**, notify the application program when the event occurs, and **execute the associated responsive action in response thereto.**” Independent 16, and all dependent claims that depend from Claim 16 (Claims 17-20), include similar event service features by reciting “**creating an event and an associated responsive action that are associated with the application program; in response to occurrence of the event, executing the responsive action, ...**”. Thus, Claims 7, 10, 12, 14, and 16-20 recite an event service configured to receive registration of an event and an associated responsive action from an application program, and to execute the responsive action in response to the occurrence of the event.

MEAD does not teach, describe, or suggest any such event service feature. The passages cited in the Office Action (MEAD, col. 15, line 65 to 16, line 10, and col. 16, line 37 to col. 17, line 25) describe some features of the LDAP protocol but have nothing to do with an event service. For example, the passage in col. 15, line 65 to col. 16, line 10 describes that a client transmits a protocol request to the LDAP server and the LDAP server is then responsible for performing the LDAP operations specified in the request

against an LDAP directory. The passage in col. 16, line 37 to col. 17, line 25 describes the format an LDAP message that is used to encapsulate all protocol exchanges between the client and the LDAP server. Significantly, however, neither these passages nor any other passage in MEAD describes or suggests anything that is equivalent to the event service features of Claims 7, 10, 12, 14, and 16-20.

For these reasons, MEAD does not describe or suggest the event service features of Claims 7, 10, 12, 14, 16-18, and 20. Furthermore, in rejecting Claim 19, the Office Action relies explicitly on MEAD, and not on NESSETT, to support prior disclosure of an event service feature. Since MEAD does not describe any event service features, the combination of MEAD with NESSETT necessarily fails to teach all of the features of Claim 19. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 7, 10, 12, 14, and 16-20 is respectfully requested.

C. MEAD cannot be used to support the rejections of Claims 6 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) because MEAD and the present application are assigned to the same Assignee

At the time of the invention of the subject matter claimed in the present application, both MEAD and the present application were owned by, and subject to an obligation of assignment to, Cisco Technology, Inc. (In fact, Cisco Technology, Inc. owns both MEAD and the present application.) Further, MEAD qualifies as prior art against the claims of the present application only under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Thus, under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) as amended by the CREATE Act, MEAD cannot be used in a 103 rejection against the claims of the present application.

For this reason, the rejections of Claims 6 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over MEAD are improper. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 6 and 19 is respectfully requested.

IV. CONCLUSION

The Applicant believes that all issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed. Further, for the reasons set forth above, the Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

A petition for extension of time for one month, in order to make this reply timely filed, is hereby made. A law firm's check for the petition for extension of time fee is enclosed herewith. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: August 21, 2006



Stoycho D. Draganoff
Reg. No. 56,181

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1089
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext. 208
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076